

The North Carolina Standard.

THOMAS LORING,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1840.

VOL. VI.—NO. 281.

THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

TERMS:

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD is published weekly, at three dollars per annum—payable yearly in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued, until all arrearages are paid.

Advertisements, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted *gratis* for one dollar, and, twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion; those of greater length in proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out.

Court Advertisements and Sheriff's Sales, will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the usual rates.

A deduction of 33 1/3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year.

* Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

SPEECH OF MR. FISHER,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

In the House of Representatives, Feb. 25, 1840. On the resolution offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Tennessee, instructing the Committee of Elections to report forthwith to the House which of the claimants for the five vacant seats from New Jersey have received a majority of the whole number of votes polled in New Jersey at the late election for Representatives to the present Congress; and also to report certain papers, to be printed, &c.

Mr. FISHER said: As the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fillmore] declines proceeding with his remarks, I will take up the subject, and submit a few observations. And, in the first place, I must express my surprise at the efforts that are being made here to state on it—this, too, at a time when great complaints are heard from every quarter against the tardiness of our movements. In the next place, I must express my utter astonishment that there should be any objection whatever to the Committee's reporting the fact who have received the majority of votes, or to the publication of the papers giving information on the subject. Are gentlemen unwilling to receive information? Are they unwilling to receive it to spread before the people? If there be any lights before the committee, is it right to lock them up in the committee room—to hide them under a bushel? Why not bring them out, and set them on a hill, that all may see them? I think, Sir, it is due to this House itself, to the people of New Jersey, and to the whole American people, that all the information before the committee should be brought out, and made public.

In the first place, it is due to this House itself. Why? This House refused to permit the five individuals who came here with the Governor's certificates to take the seats. For this decision we have been assailed in the most unqualified terms, and denounced by the Governor of New Jersey as having been guilty of "a monstrous usurpation." Now, Sir, the facts ought to be made public, that the American people may judge whether this charge be true or false; whether it is this House, or Governor Pennington and his Privy Council, who have trampled on the Constitution and on the laws, and committed this "monstrous usurpation."

In the next place, it is in an especial manner due to the people of New Jersey that all the facts should be made public, in order that they may see why they have not their full representation on this floor. There are ten individuals here claiming the five vacant seats, and yet neither set is permitted to occupy them. The people of New Jersey have a right to be informed why this is so. Five of these claimants have come out, and, in advance, charged the whole blame on the majority of this House. In their letter to the Governor of New Jersey, written no doubt for effect, and published every where, they characterize the proceedings of this House as an outrage—as a disgrace to the body itself—as the exercise of a "lawless and revolutionary power"; and they charge that the majority disregard their "oaths to support the Constitution." Now, Sir, these are grave charges, and the facts should be made public, that it may be seen whether this House be guilty of usurpation in exercising a power expressly delegated to it; or whether these five claimants are not the culprits in trying to usurp seats on this floor, when they know they have not received a majority of the votes of the people of New Jersey.

There is yet another reason why nothing should be kept back, but all made public. The majority in the Legislature of New Jersey have taken up this subject, and have passed a series of resolutions, denouncing this House in the most unmeasured terms. They were not content to pass these resolutions, and circulate them in New Jersey, but they have sent them to all the other States in this Union, thereby inviting action on them.

Now, that the Legislatures of these States may be enabled to act understandingly on the subject forced on them by these resolutions, let us give them all the facts we can, lest, like His Excellency of Virginia, they may act on one-sided evidence alone. Perhaps, however, His Excellency may not have stood in need of light on the subject; he may know all about it by intuition. I hope, Sir, these will be considered good reasons why the resolution should be adopted by the House in the form in which it has now been presented to us.

Mr. F. continued. It has been decided, Sir, by the vote just taken, that it is not in order to quote what has been done in the committee; and yet, without referring to the proceedings of the committee, it is difficult to explain things as they ought to be. Much censure has been thrown on the committee from various quarters, and, for one, I wish that the whole proceeding may be made public; for, whatever may be the result, I feel that my skirts are clear. I do not, however, believe that the journal of the committee will reflect much light on the subject. I have no doubt it will be considered a great literary curiosity; for, in my opinion, it is the most ex-

traordinary journal that ever has been kept since the keeping of journals first began. Sir, did you ever read in ancient fable of an unfortunate wight, who was condemned to roll a huge stone up hill all his life? how, after pushing, and pulling, and tugging, to get it up to the top of the hill, it would slip from his hands and roll down again? If you have, you may form some idea of the labors of the committee. Or, Sir, did you ever read in ancient story the history of the faithful Penelope, who spent the day in weaving her web, and the night in winding it out again? If so, perhaps you may form some idea of the labors of the committee. The object of Penelope was to gain time.

[Mr. F. was here called to order for referring to the proceedings of the committee; and, after some discussion on the points of order, he was suffered to proceed with his remarks.]

He continued. Sir, it is not my purpose to anticipate the publication of the facts, but I wish to disabuse the public mind on a few points.

No one on this floor, or any where else, has ever pretended that the certificate men received a majority of the votes polled at the late Congressional election in New Jersey. Nor has it been asserted here or elsewhere, that the others did not receive a majority; on the contrary, it has been so admitted. When, therefore, the certificate men came forward and claimed the seats, they did so, not on the ground that they had received a majority of the votes; but on the ground that they had received the Governor's certificate. On the other hand, the other five claimed the seats on the ground that they had received a majority of the votes. The real and undisputed question, then, that was in the first instance presented to this House, and that is now before the House, is this: which set of claimants shall be admitted to seats here? those who have the Governor's certificates without having received a majority of votes, or those who have no certificates, but who have received a majority of votes? I am one of those who will never consent that the voice of the people shall be set aside by a Governor or by any one else. Judging from circumstances, it would seem that the five certificate men themselves did not believe altogether in the certificates—for, either through the want of faith in their certificates, or with some other view, they went to work last fall in hunting up illegal votes; and behold they lay before this House a list of 243 votes, which they say are illegal. This list of votes reputed to be illegal, has been extensively published throughout the country as a sort of set-off to the majority admitted to have been received at the boxes of their opponents; and it has been done, too, in such a manner as to make many believe that two hundred and forty-three illegal votes have actually been discovered. Now, Sir, what is the fact? Why, they cannot show, by duly authenticated papers, even one dozen bad votes; their own competent papers show less than twelve illegal votes.

[Mr. F. was here again called to order for referring to papers in the committee, and, after some discussion on the point of order, the Speaker decided that he had a right to refer to papers that had been read in this House, though not now in possession of the House. From this decision an appeal was taken, and the ayes and noes called for. The Speaker was sustained in his decision by the House, and Mr. F. was then permitted to go on.]

Mr. F. then proceeded to say: I wish, Sir, to set the public mind right on another point. By turning to the list headed illegal votes, it will be seen that it is there charged that eight Whig votes were taken out of the box at Saddle River township, and eight Democratic votes were put in, and, of course, afterwards counted—thus making a difference of sixteen votes. Now, Sir, what I wish to say is, that this charge has not been proven.

[He was then again called to order for alluding to papers not before the House, and, after a considerable interruption, was again permitted to proceed.]

As, Sir, I cannot be permitted to refer directly to the papers, I must either stop altogether or do so indirectly. I will, however, first make a prediction or two. I will then predict, whenever the House examines the papers on this charge, they will find it wholly unsupported by proof as yet laid before the committee. The judges and inspectors of the polls held at Saddle River, are reported to be men of as fair character as any in the State of New Jersey. When this charge was first made, they not only gave it a flat denial, but they said if the charge was true, it was an indictable offence, and should be taken notice of by the law. They challenged their accusers to go before the grand jury, and have it investigated. They have not done so; nor have they made good the charge before any other tribunal whatever. Why have they not? It must be because they cannot; for, if they could, we have every reason to believe they would. And yet, Sir, this Saddle River affair has been held up, here and elsewhere, as an established fact, that the ballot box was robbed.

But, Sir, let us examine the grounds on which the Governor took on himself the right to set aside the will of the people, and to give the certificates to those who were rejected by the people. Where did he receive this power? Not from the Constitution of the United States, for that gives no such power to him, or to any body else; nor did he receive it from the laws of New Jersey, for the laws of New Jersey expressly require that the Governor and Privy Council shall ascertain "who have received the greatest number of votes from the whole State," and commit them accordingly. Where, then, did he get the power and right to throw away all the votes polled at South Amboy and Millville, which gave a clear majority of 458 in favor of the Democratic candidates? When all the facts are brought to light, it will be found that this Governor, who charged this House with "a monstrous usurpation," has himself trampled on all law, and committed a daring outrage on the rights of the people. In justification of his conduct, it is put forth every where, that the returns from South Amboy were not made in time by the judge and inspectors of the polls to the clerk of the county, whose business it was to send them up to the Governor. The fact is otherwise. The returns from South Amboy were delivered to the clerk a whole day before the time expired; but this clerk, without any authority of law whatever, undertook to set himself up as judge, and actually rejected the votes, on pretence that they were not "returned pursuant to law," and refused to insert them in the list sent by him to the Governor.

Nevertheless, a full statement of these votes was not, certified by the judge and inspectors, and delivered to the Governor in due time; but he and his Privy Council rejected them because they did not come to him through the clerk; and in this way the people were deprived of their sacred rights by the doings of the clerk on the one hand, and a partisan Governor on the other. And here, let it be remembered, that, at the time of this transaction, not a word was said about illegal votes. Neither the clerk, nor the Governor, pretended to allege that the polls of South Amboy were thrown aside on account of illegal votes. No; the excuse of the clerk was, that the returns were not made "pursuant to law"; and the excuse of the Governor was, that they did not come to him through the clerk. The allegation of bad votes was altogether an after affair, and, without a doubt, got up to turn public attention off from the conduct of the Governor and the two clerks.

As to the returns of Millville, there it is true that the returns were not made to the clerk by 5 o'clock on Saturday evening, as required by the law of N. Jersey, but they were made between 10 and 11 o'clock that night. Was this, however, a good reason for rejecting the votes of the free-men of New Jersey? If the returning officer fell four or five hours behind his time, are the people to be punished for his neglect? If he violated the law, punish him; but do not disfranchise free-men for his laches. Who before this ever heard of an instance where the people lost their votes, after having given them in according to law, merely because the returning officer did not do his duty? In New Jersey, at least, such a thing was never before heard of; there the practice has always been the other way. It is a remarkable fact, that in the year 1832, a case occurred in this very township of Millville precisely in point. In that year, the returning officers of the polls at Millville failed to deliver the returns to the clerk until 12 o'clock at night, whereas they ought to have been delivered by 5 o'clock. The clerk sent on his returns to the Governor, omitting the votes of Millville, because he did not receive them by 5 o'clock. He, however, soon after made out a certificate of the facts, and sent it up. The Governor & Privy Council received the votes, and counted them, and, what is more, these votes then turned the scale in the election, as the votes of the same place now do. This, too, was done by a Whig Governor, (Southard), and by a Whig Council. But this is not all. At this same election of 1838, a contested election took place in the county of Cumberland, in which Millville is situated, and the irregularity of this return from Millville came before the present Legislature of New Jersey. The matter was referred to a committee, a majority of which was composed of Whigs. The majority and the minority both made reports. The Whigs, in their report, declare, "they will not suppose that the voice of the people, fairly expressed at the ballot box, if ascertainable, will be disregarded merely for the reason that the duty of making the certificate of election has been negligently, ignorantly, or even fraudulently performed, or omitted, by any of the officers upon whom that duty is imposed." Now is it not strange that these same Whigs of the Legislature of New Jersey, in the course of a few months, after adopting these just principles, should change about and denounce this House for acting on them? It only shows that party ambition is stronger with them than either a sense of consistency or the feelings of patriotism.

[Mr. F. was here interrupted for referring to the action of the committee.]

Mr. F. said I am very desirous to pursue this subject still farther, but it must be apparent to all, from the various interruptions I have received, the calls to order, and the questions of order, that it will be next to impossible to do so. The moment I refer to a paper now before the committee, I am called to order. The moment I take up a pamphlet to read, a question of order is raised, and rather than proceed amidst this constant interruption, I will abandon this part of the subject for the present, and turn to another where I anticipate no interruptions.

Mr. F. continued, on the constitutional question of certificate and seal. I will now, Sir, proceed to take a rapid notice of the argument, which on a former occasion was so much relied on in this case. I mean the great platform argument, on which all the speeches from one side of this House have been built. Without claiming to possess any constitutional learning, I will endeavor to test this argument by the rules of common sense, and plain reasoning. And that I may not do injustice to this famous argument, I will endeavor to state it in the very words of those who have advanced it here; from the very able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. Bell] to the humbler orators in this debate.

"That this House cannot go beyond the certificates of the Governor to inquire who are entitled to the seats; but that we must take the certificates in the first instance, as conclusive evidence that they who hold them, are entitled to the seats." Or, in other words, "that whoever presents himself here with the certificate of election, is thereby entitled to his seat on this floor."

Now, Sir, to test this proposition, we must, in the first place, see what powers the Constitution gives to the House on this subject. The words of the Constitution are as follows: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." (Article I, section 3.) "Shall be the judge!" But if it be true that we cannot go beyond the certificate, to examine evidence, but must receive it as full and conclusive evidence that they who hold it are entitled to their seats, then it follows most clearly that the House is not the judge. It is not the judge, because it can exercise no discretionary power whatever—it has no choice—it cannot look into facts, or law; but it is wholly passive, without the power to choose or reject. To judge, implies the power to examine testimony—to hear both sides—to make up a judgment—and to decide according to evidence; but if it be true that we cannot look behind the certificate, then the House cannot examine either facts or law, and consequently cannot judge. Thus, by the argument of gentlemen, the Constitution is nullified, and this House is made a mere passive creature, without a single attribute of a judge.

But this is not all; for this argument of gentlemen not only makes a dead letter of the Constitution, which constitutes this House the judge; it goes farther, and makes the maker of the certificate sole and exclusive judge of all elections

to Congress. In the present case it makes Governor Pennington sole and exclusive judge. Now let us see if this be not the consequence.

It will be admitted by all, that before Governor Pennington made out his certificates, he had before him all the returns, including those from South Amboy and Millville, which, taken together, gave a decided majority to the Democratic candidates. It will be also admitted, that with these papers before him, he had the power to decide in favor of either party. He did decide in favor of his political friends—the Whig candidates—and gave them his certificates. Now if it be true that we cannot go beyond this certificate, then in admitting these five men to seats here, we do so not because they have received a majority of votes in New Jersey, but because they have received the Governor's certificate; and thus, to all intents and purposes, you constitute the maker of the certificate sole judge in the case. But to make this conclusion more palpable, let us pursue it a little farther. Suppose Governor Pennington, with the papers before him, had given his certificates to the other five, as we contend he ought to have done, they having received a majority of the votes, then, according to the doctrine of gentlemen, the other five would have been the members. Why so? Not because they had received the majority of the votes, but because they held the certificate, thus making Governor Pennington not only sole judge, but likewise sole elector! He had the power to give his certificate to either party; and whoever holds his certificate, are to be hailed here as the true members. Now, Sir, do you think that the Constitution ever meant to give the Governor of a State a paramount power over the votes of the people of that State? a power to set aside the votes of the majority, and substitute his own will in their stead?

But, Sir, let us examine this matter yet a little farther. Suppose this wonderful Governor by way of showing what the great seal in his hands could do, had put aside both sets of candidates, and had given his certificates to five of his Privy Council; these five, with certificates in hand, had come on here, and taken seats, and at the same time the other claimants had come on and made known to you the whole fraud—you understand it fully, and believe it all—yet, according to the argument of gentlemen, you can take no notice of it, but you are bound to receive these spurious members, place them in seats, and vote with them, and do all this merely because they hold the Governor's certificate under the great seal of the State! There is no end to the absurdities into which this doctrine, that you cannot go behind the certificate, will involve us; and, gentlemen seeing this, have endeavored to extricate themselves by attaching some qualifications to it. Let us examine these.

They say, that although you cannot be beyond the certificate in the first instance, but must admit the holders of it to take seats and exercise all the rights of members; yet after they have taken seats, and become invested with membership, then, and not till then, you may take up the case, look beyond the certificate, examine and judge turn out the certificate men, and put in the others. Now, let us look at this view of the subject. If this argument be true, then it must stand upon two propositions, which it necessarily presupposes, but if these two propositions are false, then the argument itself must be false, for it rests on them alone.

The first of these propositions is this: that the House has more power after the certificate men take their seats than it had before, that is, that the House acquires power from the circumstance of the certificate men taking seats; for it is evident if the House can declare that the certificate men are not entitled to seats after we admit them, which we could not do before admitting them, then, of course, the House has gained power by the fact of their admission, since it can do, after they are admitted, what it could not do before. Now I deny that the House acquires any power by the circumstance of the certificate men taking their seats, and I disprove it by a direct appeal to the Constitution itself.

I disprove it in this way. We meet here under a written Constitution. We derive our existence and all our powers from it, and from no other source whatever. These powers, thus derived, are expressly laid down in the Constitution, and cannot be increased or diminished by any law, custom, or usage whatever. For this plain reason, that whatever modifies, that is, increases or lessens the powers derived from the Constitution, must be greater than the Constitution, and may entirely change or destroy it. But as there is no power greater than the Constitution, except the States in convention, then it is clear if this House acquires power by the fact referred to, it must be so in consequence of something expressed or implied in the Constitution. Now I challenge gentlemen to show any thing of the sort in the Constitution. If they cannot show it, then it will be because it is not there; and if not there, their assumption is false, and falls to the ground.

The second proposition that gentlemen must show to be true before their argument can stand, is this: That a man may be a legitimate member of this House before he takes a seat, who is not so after he takes it; or in other words, that today you are bound to admit him because he is a legitimate member, and to-morrow you are bound to turn him out because he is not a legitimate member. This proposition is not only necessary presupposed by the argument of gentlemen, but it has been expressly laid down by several speakers. The gentleman from New York, who is reputed to be an able lawyer, actually asserted it as a sort of political axiom, in his speech delivered on the New Jersey case several weeks ago. He then said:

"Whatever eventually may be the result, the certificate in the first instance, and for the time being fully and absolutely invests him who holds it with the right of membership."

Now let us see if this proposition will bear the test. Who makes member of Congress? By the Constitution, the people of the several States choose their members of Congress. Whoever receives a majority of the qualified vote; given according to the rules of law, thereby becomes the member. Mark it—it is not the certificate of the governor, but the votes of the people, that make members.

Whenever, therefore, a man presents himself here, either with or without a certificate, this may be said of him as true—that he is either a member or he is not a member. He cannot be a member and not a member at the same

time; he must be one or the other. If he is a member then all admit that the House cannot rightfully divest him of his membership. If he is not a member, then it is equally clear that the House cannot make him one. The House cannot add to, or take away, in the smallest degree, the rights of membership, for to say that it can do so would be to say that it can modify the powers given by the Constitution and consequently must be greater than the Constitution, and may change or destroy it at will. Now apply this argument to the five certificate men from New Jersey: they are either members or they are not. If they are members, they were made so by votes of the people; but suppose they were not made so by the votes of the people—then by what authority is it that you admit them as members? Why, according to the argument of gentlemen, by authority of the Governor's certificate. Thus, then, it follows that the Governor's certificate empowers you to do what the Constitution gives you no right to do—to make members of Congress; and consequently, the certificate is greater than the Constitution; and thus you see, the whole argument so much relied on by gentlemen runs itself into a political absurdity, and falls to the ground with the false prop that held it up.

The sum of the whole matter is this: If this famous argument so much relied on be true, then the Constitution is a dead letter; but as the Constitution is in force, and paramount to these potential certificates, then the argument itself is a political absurdity.

Mr. F. continued. I will take this occasion briefly to notice another most extraordinary argument that has been gravely advanced on this floor, and that has been seized on and acted on by the Governor of New Jersey and his party in the Legislature. The argument is this:—"That the Congress of the United States is made up of members from the twenty-six States; that if any State is not represented here, it cannot be a Congress, and, of course, cannot do business. But you have excluded the certificate men from New Jersey, ergo, you have no Congress, and can do no business." This is certainly a new argument, and the distinguished gentlemen from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania [Mr. Adams and Mr. Sergeant] are entitled to the honor of the first discovery.

If this argument be true, then the 5th section of the 1st article of the Constitution must be inoperative; for if either House, by exercising the power there granted, excludes a single member from either body, such exclusion dissolves Congress, and renders all its acts unconstitutional. According to this new argument, there can be no Congress unless every State is fully represented. If this be not the meaning then the argument does not apply to New Jersey, since New Jersey has now one representative on this floor, and two in the Senate; and, if it applies to New Jersey, then it must equally apply to every other State.

Now, let us look at the absurdities into which this construction of the Constitution will involve us.

Several States in this Union have but a single Representative in this House. Now, if on any account whatever, either of these Representatives should be excluded from this House, then such exclusion acts as a dissolution Congress, and all that is done must necessarily be unconstitutional.

But it is even worse than this; for if you exclude even a single one of the forty members of New York, the same result takes place. If this doctrine be true, then I doubt whether there ever has been a real constitutional Congress since the constitution was adopted; for I doubt whether there ever has been a session when every State in the Union was fully represented.

If this argument be true, then that section of the constitution which says—"a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business"—means just nothing at all. If this doctrine be true, then it is in the power of any member to dissolve Congress at his will and pleasure. He has nothing to do but resign his seat, put on his hat, walk out, and Congress is at an end. Will it be contended that our wise ancestors in framing the Constitution, ever meant such a thing as this? It is absurd to suppose it. And yet, let it be known, that this famous Governor of New Jersey and his plant majority in the Legislature, with the desperation of drowning men have caught at this floating straw, and set it forth in solemn resolutions and sent them to all the States in this Union inviting action on them; not only so, but sent them to you, and to this House, in a way and manner insulting to both. But Sir, this is not the first time this game was played off in this country. We read, that during the Revolutionary war, one of the British commanders attempted the same thing with General Washington. In following the example of Washington you did well, Sir. He returned the package to Governor Pennington. There let it rest with the argument that brought it forth.

Mr. F. in continuing his remarks, said, there is one other subject connected with this question on which I wish to make a few remarks. All of us who have refused to let the certificate men take their seats, have been charged with violating State rights. Now, Sir, I am a States rights man, and repel the charge as wholly unfounded—particularly as coming from those who never until now, showed any zeal for State rights. What are State rights? I will tell you: the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers, that is, it has no power, is but what are given to it in the Constitution. All powers not given to it by the Constitution, are expressly reserved to the States and the people. See the 10th article of the amendments. These reserved powers are the State rights. The only way, then, in which this House, or this Government can encroach on State rights is to assume and exercise powers not granted in the Constitution. Now, did this House assume an undelimited power in taking cognizance of this case, and excluding the certificate men from this floor? Certainly not, if there be any meaning in the words of the Constitution, "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each House shall constitute a quorum to do business." From this it is perfectly clear, that in acting on this question, so far from assuming a doubtful power, we were only doing what the Constitution made it our especial duty to do, and what no other tribunal has a right to do. How, then, have we invaded State rights? So far

from trespassing on State rights, this House, on the present occasion has defended State rights & the rights of the people of New Jersey, from one of the boldest assaults upon them, that ever has been perpetrated in this Republic; an assault, which, if crowned with success, will soon prostrate the sacred rights of the elective franchise in the dust, and leave them to be trampled on by every petty partisan Governor who may happen to have in his keeping the great seal of a State.

Mr. F. said there were various other extraordinary arguments resorted to on a former occasion to justify the conduct of the Governor of New Jersey, which it would be out of time now to consider. Indeed he would not now have taken up the constitutional question at all, but for two considerations: the first was that on a former occasion he was cut off by the previous question from saying a word on that question; and the next was, that on this occasion, he was prevented by constant interruptions, from pursuing the course of remarks he intended when he took the floor.

HARD CIDER ANA.

LIQUOR NOT ALL OUT YET.—The Tory Times, whose editor was here on the 22nd, says, that Gen. Harrison's "military services were greater and longer" than Gen. Jackson's.

Gen. Harrison will run well.

Louisville Journal.

No doubt of it, if you put an Indian at his heels.

Hartford Times.

It seems that Harrison's conduct at Tippecanoe was so much doubted at the time, that he got the officers of the Indiana militia to certify that he did not run away.

The Little Rock (Arkansas) Gazette says, that "Whiggery is at so low an ebb, (in that State) that it is doubtful whether there will be even a Harrison electoral ticket nominated." Perhaps they have no show wagons in that State, nor monkeys to man them!

A Whig coxcomb a few days since declared that "Gen. Harrison never received a blow from an insolent enemy." "And no wonder faith," said Pat, who was within hearing—"he never had courage enough to go within striking distance of an enemy."

The Feds elect Gen. Harrison almost every day, in some steam-boat, or railroad car. These travelling wisecracks, remind us of an old Milford Whig, who remarked, just after their fall town meeting, that Mr. Van Buren stood no chance of re-election. "Why so?" inquired a democrat:—"Because," said he, "the people in Milford are two to one against him—and 'squire Carrington says if he can't carry Milford he's gone."

New Haven Register.

FROM THE NORTH CAROLINIAN.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

A meeting of the democratic citizens of Cumberland, was held at the Court House, in Fayetteville on Thursday the 3rd inst. for the purpose of appointing delegates to meet their Republican friends of this district, in convention at Rockingham on the 17th inst., for the purpose of selecting a delegate to Baltimore, also an Elector for this district.

Whereupon, L. D. Henry Esq., was called to the Chair, and James G. Cook and James McKethan, were appointed Secretaries.

The object of the meeting having been explained in an eloquent and patriotic speech by the Chairman, the following Committee were appointed to draft a preamble and resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, viz: Jas. C. Dobbin, Esq. Doctor T. N. Cameron, Col. David Gillis, J. C. Williams Esq. and Jas. A. Byrne, Esq. who after retiring a short time, reported the following preamble and Resolutions.

Whereas, it is proposed to hold a District Convention of the Democratic Republican party at Rockingham, Richmond County, on the 17th day of March instant, for the purpose of nominating an Elector for this Electoral district, and also to appoint a delegate to the National Convention which is to assemble in the city of Baltimore in May next, to recommend candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That we approve the objects of said District Convention and that we will appoint delegates thereto.

Resolved, That 23 delegates, be selected to represent the Democratic party of this county, in said convention.

Resolved, That having undiminished confidence in the patriotism, virtue and integrity, of Mr. Van Buren, and believing his re-election essential to the preservation of our rights and interests, we will use all honorable means to sustain him in the coming election.

Resolved, That we are opposed to the election to the Presidency, of Gen. W. H. Harrison, the nominee of the Harrisburg convention, because we believe his political views and feelings are adverse to the doctrines and policy of the Republican party of this country. Because we believe him in favor of a general system of Internal Improvements by the General Government. Because he is in favor of a high tariff of duties, so ruinous to the interests of the whole Southern portion of our country, and because, we believe if he is not an abolitionist himself, he is the favorite candidate of that united band of fanatics whose ultimate aim is the subversion of our rights and the prostration of our peculiar institutions. In proof of this opinion, we refer to the recorded declarations of some of the leading abolitionists at the North. Hear what Garrison, the editor of the Liberator says on the subject of the Harrisburg convention. "It will be remembered that, in balloting for a candidate at Harrisburg, all the delegates from the slaveholding States voted for Henry Clay on every trial, until a choice was effected. The South, then, was defeated in its wishes, it tried to get a slave holder nominated, and could not succeed, solely because he was a slave holder. It was anti-slavery in the free States that defeated slavery at the South. The Whigs would have preferred Mr. Clay to General Harrison, but they were afraid to make the experiment. This is conceded on all sides. True, the Southern delegation at Harrisburg, in the last resort, agreed to support Harrison, but it was an act of necessity and not of choice. Declarations of a similar character and import might be multiplied, it is unnecessary; to believe and to know that General Harrison is emphatically the favorite candidate of the abolition party, is enough for those who value their rights, we shall therefore strenuously oppose his election, and the election of all state officers who advocate his claims.

We further oppose the election of General Harrison in that, he acknowledges the constitu-